

1
2
3
4
5
6 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
7 DISTRICT OF NEVADA

8 * * * * *

9 ELMIRA COPELAND,)
10 vs. Plaintiff,) 3:05-cv-00290-LRH (RAM)
11 DAVID THAWLEY, et al.,) ORDER
12 Defendants.)
13)
14)

15 WHEREAS, the Defendants have responded (#34 & 38) to the court's October 30, 2006,
16 Minute Order (#30) and the Plaintiff has replied (#37), the court finds that the McDonald Carano
17 Wilson, LLP law firm (hereinafter "McDonald Carano law firm"), of which this judge was a
18 partner prior to his appointment to the bench in 2001, is not a counsel of record in this case, is
19 not an interested party in this case, and has no pecuniary interest in the outcome of this case.

20 The court further finds that there is no indication of probable participation of the
21 McDonald Carano law firm in this action.

22 Good cause appearing, the suggestion of voluntary recusal is denied.

23 IT IS SO ORDERED.

24 DATED this 8th day of December, 2006.



25
26
27 LARRY R. HICKS
28 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE